DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 323 HE 014 781

TITLE High School/College Partnerships. 1981 Current Issues in Higher Education, No 1.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 25p.; Selected papers presented at the Annual National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 1981).
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($3.50 plus postage and handling).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Articulation (Education); College Faculty; *College Preparation; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Curriculum Development; Educational Quality; English Curriculum; Equal Education; Higher Education; Humanities; Minority Groups; Reading Skills; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Curriculum; Secondary School Teachers; Teamwork; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *City University of New York Queens College; Project EQuality; *University of South Dakota

ABSTRACT

The need for better high school/college articulation is addressed in five papers. In "High School/College Partnerships That Work," Ernest L. Boyer describes the ongoing efforts to encourage high school/college collaboration and considers five principles necessary for establishing cooperative programs, including the need for educators at both levels to agree that they do have common problems, and the need to focus on one or two specific goals to keep the programs sharply focused. Michael O'Keefe, in "High School/College Cooperative Programs," describes model programs to facilitate student articulation,improve the quality of secondary education, and build professional relationships between high school and college teachers. In "Humanities for the High Schools," Gale K. Crouse describes the University of South Dakota's program of Extended Teacher Institutes, which bring university faculty together with teams of high school teachers and administrators to create integrated humanities courses for individual high schools. In "Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: the Queens English Project," Janet R. Brown describes an effort at Queens College in New York to build the reading and writing skills of 11th and 12th grade students through the efforts of faculty and administrators from local high schools and the college. In "Quality and Equality in High School Curriculum: A College Board Study," George H. Hanford describes Project EQuality, a 10-year project that emphasizes both equality through access (especially for minorities) and quality through revised college preparatory curricula. The effort has been launched with a dialogue among school and college teachers. (SW)

1981 Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 1

High School/College Partnerships

ED213323

High School/College Partnerships That Work 1
Ernest L. Boyer

High School/College Cooperative Programs 5
Michael O'Keefe

Humanities for the High Schools 11
Gale K. Crouse

Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project 14
Janet R. Brown

Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study 19
George H. Hanford

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 281

American Association for Higher Education

Copyright 1981

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization open to all individuals concerned with the value and effectiveness of higher education. Each year AAHE's National Conference on Higher Education brings together some 2,000 educational administrators, faculty, students, representatives of education agencies and associations, government and foundation officials, and others to discuss common concerns, disseminate effective educational practices, and focus on the future of higher education. The theme of the 1981 Conference was "Promising Frontiers: Five Partnerships for Higher Education."

Current Issues in Higher Education is based on topics addressed at the Conference. Selected papers presented at the Conference are included in the five monographs that make up the 1981 series. Several additional papers were prepared especially for publication here.

AAHE members receive *Current Issues in Higher Education* as part of their membership fee. Copies of individual issues of the series also are available, as listed on the inside back cover.

AAHE Board of Directors, 1980–81

Chair
Martha E. Church
Hood College

Vice Chair
David G. Brown
Miami University

Past Chair
Martin A. Kramer
Berkeley, California

Marie E. Childers
Illinois Board of Higher Education

R. Morton Darrow
Prudential Insurance Company of America

Carolyne K. Davis
University of Michigan

Paul A. Elsner
Maricopa County Community College District

Carol Frances
American Council on Education

O.B. Hardison, Jr.
Folger Shakespeare Library

Sister Colette Mahoney, RSHM
Marymount Manhattan College

Anne-Marie McCartan
California Community Colleges

Wilbert J. McKeachie
University of Michigan

Robert F. Sexton
Kentucky Council on Higher Education

Donald M. Stewart
Spelman College

Elizabeth Wells
Cincinnati, Ohio

Willard Wirtz
National Institute for Work and Learning

Foreword

On both the national and local levels, educational institutions and foundations are undertaking projects to improve the preparation of high school students for college. With the declining number of high school students, each one will have to be better educated to meet the needs of society for community leaders, employers, employees, and citizens. With the changing composition of young America—the increasing number of black and Hispanic youth and the traditional underrepresentation of these young people among high school and college graduates—the need for better high school/college articulation is reinforced. The five papers in this monograph all address this need.

To encourage collaboration between high schools and college is one of the goals of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, headed by Ernest L. Boyer. In his paper, Boyer elaborates on five principles necessary for establishing cooperative programs and describes the ongoing work of the foundation.

Providing an overview of the types of high school/college programs currently in operation, Michael O'Keefe describes model programs to facilitate student articulation, improve the quality of secondary education, and build professional relationships between high school and college teachers. The paper includes a list of the names and addresses of the 12 programs mentioned.

Gale K. Crouse of the University of South Dakota and Janet R. Brown of Queens College in New York in their papers outline the high school/college projects their institutions are involved in. At South Dakota, Extended Teacher Institutes bring university faculty together with teams of high school teachers and administrators to create integrated humanities courses for individual high schools. The Queens English Project is an effort to build the reading and writing skills of 11th and 12th grade students through the efforts of faculty and administrators from local high schools and Queens College.

Stressing the curricular reforms needed to improve the high school/college articulation, George Hanford gives an overview of the College Board's Project EQuality. The 10-year project emphasizes both equality through access and quality through revised college preparatory curricula has been launched with a dialogue among school and college teachers and an effort to increase substantially the numbers of college-bound minority students.

High School/College Partnerships That Work

Ernest L. Boyer

Because nothing is more important to the public good than the education of youth, high school/college cooperation is essential. This collaboration requires: recognizing the common problems, overcoming the traditional "pecking order," creating focused goals, rewarding participants, and focusing on action.

Just one year ago—at the 1980 AAHE National Conference—I talked about building connections between the nation's colleges and schools. On that occasion, I observed that we've pretended we could have quality in higher education without working with the schools which are, in fact, the foundation of everything we do.

I'm convinced that the crisis in education is as acute today as it was one year ago and that the need for school/college collaboration urgently persists. At the Carnegie Foundation we are now deeply involved in a study of the American high school and it's already very clear that if we are to achieve academic excellence, the purposes of education must be clarified, school leadership must be strengthened, curriculum must be more sharply focused, and somehow the rigid, four-year lockstep must be broken. But it is also clear—just as it was one year ago—that the schools cannot do it all alone. They need help of parents, the community, business, and industry. Above all, they need the help of higher learning institutions which prepare the teachers, shape the curriculum, and, in a very fundamental way, set the nation's academic standards.

Five basic principles

During the past twelve months, I've heard from literally dozens of school and college people from coast to coast who have moved beyond pious platitudes and who actually are running collaborative programs in the schools. I'd like to draw from these experiences and focus here on *five basic principles* of collaboration that are absolutely crucial.

One: To achieve school/college cooperation educators at both levels must agree that they do indeed have common problems.

This point is embarrassingly obvious—it's like Knute Rockne telling his players that first they need a football. And yet the harsh truth is that many educators are convinced that they can go it all alone.

Several months ago, Daniel Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress, and I sponsored a National Symposium on Creativity. On that occasion Boorstin reminded us that Henry David Thoreau scorned the idea of stringing telegraph lines between New England and Texas. Thoreau wondered what in the world New Englanders and Texans could possibly have to say to one another!

Today, many school and college people are like Texans and New Englanders before the telegraph. They have no messages to send—or so they think. And yet education is a seamless web and communication between the sectors is urgently required. Let me give just one example to illustrate the point. We hear a lot of talk these days about the demographic shift, about how we've gone, in just ten years, from a baby boom to a baby bust. All that is true of course. The youth cohort *will* drop by more than 25 percent. And schools and colleges *will* go through the struggles of retrenchment.

But the real student story is what's going on just below the surface. In the United States today, 28 percent of all white Americans (Caucasians) are 18 years of age and under, 37 percent of all blacks are in that age group, and 42 percent of all Hispanics are 18 years of age and under. Today, the United States is the fourth largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world.

The face of young America is changing. And the new students are precisely those who have been least well served by the nation's colleges and schools. Consider these statis-

Ernest L. Boyer is president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in Washington, D.C. He presented a version of this paper to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

tics: 75 percent of white youths (aged 18 and 19) graduated from high school; 57 percent of black youths (18–19) graduated; while only 54 percent of Hispanics in this age group are high school graduates. Consider also that for the population as a whole, only 17 percent of the Hispanics 18 years of age and older have attended college. For blacks the rate is 20 percent. While 32 percent of adult whites have gone to college.

Finally, we should bear in mind that the minorities who *do* graduate from high school go to college in fewer numbers than the whites, their drop-out rates are higher, and they choose more frequently two-year and nontraditional institutions. The point I make is this: Serving a changing student body is an urgent common agenda and for the sake of these new students and the nation's future, the school system must somehow be improved.

Two: In order to achieve greater collaboration, the traditional academic "pecking order" must be overcome.

The harsh fact is that colleges and universities have had for many years a "plantation mentality" about the schools. Higher education set the ground rules and the schools were expected to go along passively. Consider, for example, the way college admission requirements are established and abandoned. Faculty committees deliberate in splendid isolation. They make decisions that have enormous impact on the school curriculum. Yet when these dramatic moves are made—teachers, principals, and superintendents rarely are consulted. Consider also, the way continuing education programs are unilaterally developed. All too often schools of education decide what courses should be taught and when they should be taught. And frequently the "real needs" of teachers are not adequately considered.

Fortunately, I believe this traditional pecking order is beginning to break down. The St. Louis school district has started something called the *Human Resources Development Project.* The program brings business leaders and professors to the schools. Today more than 6,000 students in 50 St. Louis high schools receive special lectures in their classrooms from business leaders or college faculty in such fields as architecture, biology, chemistry, computers, and journalism. About 15 college faculty from Washington University, St. Louis University, Southern Illinois University, Webster College, and University of Missouri, St. Louis, are meeting periodically with more than 1,000 students. Instruction takes place, for the most part, in the classroom setting, with regular teachers in attendance. There is some in-service (weekend) training of teachers in science, with graduate students following up with teachers in classrooms. The program is currently funded by the Danforth Foundation and federal ESAA money. Teachers from corporations and the university have volunteered their time.

But the main point I wish to make is this. In this program the *teachers* are in charge. Teachers receive a list of the resources that are available and they decide how college faculty can be used in their courses. No special lecture is offered unless teachers specifically express the need for outside help. So teachers get the help they ask for. They also get the in-service training they feel they need.

Today this St. Louis school/college project has a momentum of its own. And it is working, in part, because the traditional "academic pecking order" has been turned upside down.

Three: If school/college collaboration is to succeed the project must be sharply focused.

Recently, I was asked to visit a budding school/college project in a midwestern city. I was told with great enthusiasm that everyone had agreed to work together. At the meeting I attended, greetings were exchanged, everyone was toasted, but it soon became clear that no one knew specifically why he or she was there. The well-meaning promoters had, in fact, agreed to get together—but they were completely vague about the *specific* problem they hoped to solve collaboratively.

To put it very simply, school/college "togetherness" must be something more than an academic love-in. Serious cooperation will occur only if school and college people agree to concentrate on one or two specific goals and work to keep the program sharply focused. You simply cannot do everything at once.

Perhaps the Bay Area Writing Project illustrates the point. This university/school program began at Berkeley in 1974. It has succeeded precisely because the partners have agreed to solve one *specific* problem. The purpose of the project is to help high school teachers improve their teaching of writing. Summer institutes and in-service training led by college faculty *and* by teachers from the schools are used to achieve this goal. Those selected as summer institute teachers are named "university fellows." They become "consultants" to other schools and receive released time. Today the project has spread far beyond the Bay Area and currently more than 80 colleges in 35 states are working with thousands of secondary school teachers. The California State Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Carnegie Corporation are all involved in funding. The most recent evaluation shows that students who are taught writing by teachers participating in the project perform on the average about "twice as well" as those taught by non-project teachers. Again, the program is succeeding, in part, because everyone participating in it has agreed upon a clearly stated goal.

Four: If school/college cooperation is to succeed, those who participate must get recognition and rewards.

For eight years now Syracuse University has operated Project Advance (SUPA). Currently 4,000 high school seniors in 77 high schools in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Michigan are taking, in high school, transferrable college credit courses in biology, calculus, chemistry,

English, psychology, religion, and sociology. These courses are taught by high school teachers trained by Syracuse University and supervised by professors in the appropriate departments. Evaluations have shown that these high school seniors—who generally are in the top 20 percent of their class—do as well or better than college freshmen who take the same course on the university campus.

The project is funded by participating students. Students pay an average of $23 per credit hour, far below the regular tuition rate at Syracuse. The project receives no federal, state, or foundation funding.

Project Advance has been a great success because it is a true partnership and because the project is sharply focused. But the program is a success also because teachers are rewarded. High schools pay a stipend for teachers to participate in the Syracuse summer training program, which is viewed as professional development. The university furnishes instructional materials. Teachers receive the title of Syracuse "adjunct instructors," making them eligible for scholarship grants at the university or, in some cases, at institutions close to home. Participating teachers also may receive 50 percent of the cost of graduate credits for a masters or Ph.D. Participation in the program often leads to better jobs, to released time, and to adjustments in teacher load and class size. And those participating are recognized, within their schools and communities as outstanding teachers.

when people think about collaboration they focus first on budgets and bureaucracy . . . the most successful programs are those where people see a need and find time to act—with little red tape or extra funding.

Administrators are rewarded, too, with recognition for bringing the program to their schools. Participating professors get paid as consultants, they have "celebrity status" at the school, and they feel they are making a difference. A number of Syracuse professors have gotten involved in the program because their own children are now in high school. I'm told that Syracuse now is getting calls from high schools all across the country. It seems quite clear to me that if we're truly serious about excellence in education there should be a "University in the Schools" program in every high school in the nation, and local colleges and universities could direct the program. Such a program would not only help gifted students but would bring recognition to gifted teachers, too.

Five: For school/college cooperation to succeed it must focus on action—not machinery.

Time and time again when people think about collaboration they focus first on budgets and bureaucracy—on the costs involved, on hiring one or two directors, on renting space, and on such high-priority items as paper clips and new letterhead. This, of course, is self-defeating. And quite frankly this kind of talk is frequently a smokescreen for an unwillingness to act. While resources are important, they should not become the preoccupation of school and college planners. Time and time again, the most successful programs are those where people see a need and find time to act—with little red tape or extra funding. Washington, D.C., offers a couple of examples. Georgetown University's Fine Arts Department staff, along with top Georgetown students, have been working as volunteers with Duke Ellington High School for the Arts on theater productions—and both partners have been enormously enriched. Recently Georgetown held a conference for several hundred D.C. teachers, principals, and guidance counselors on competency testing. The Psychology Department sponsored the event. And I know that such events are taking place on campuses all across the country.

And speaking of recognitions, I have one other example to suggest. Each year Georgetown University asks its students to help select outstanding high school teachers to receive honorary degrees. The program is in its third year, and these teachers receive far and away more applause than other honorary degree recipients at commencement time. The teachers return to their schools with renewed respect from their colleagues and administrators. It's a small thing but the message it conveys is enormously important. It says that universities not only care about quality in government and quality in business and quality in the arts, but an honorary degree to an outstanding teacher says that colleges and universities *also* care about quality in the schools.

I'm convinced that every higher learning institution in the country should have some ceremony honoring outstanding teachers in the schools in their community or region. Consider the powerful impact on schools and on public attitude if each college routinely were to honor teachers, provide issue forums, and have at least one department work with a high school or two on upgrading, even in a modest way, some program activity—in music, in language, in science, in the visual arts. And the point is that much of this can be done without elaborate arrangements by focusing on ideas—not machinery.

Conclusion

In August 1981, The Carnegie Foundation hopes to push the partnership agenda another notch ahead. For the first time, the 50 chief state school officers will meet for a one-week summer institute with 50 college presidents selected by the chiefs from every state. In addition, the state higher education officers will join the conference for a day or two. At this 1981 summit meeting, education leaders from both levels for the first time will come together to consider an agenda for excellence in education in the 1980s. I'm convinced that the willingness of both sectors to exchange ideas, to recognize that they have a "common agenda," will be a significant step

toward breaking down the barriers and toward rebuilding the quality of schooling in this nation.

Here then is my conclusion: Cooperation among the nation's colleges and schools is absolutely urgent. But if we are to succeed,

- a common agenda must be acknowledged,
- a true spirit of collaboration must emerge,
- a single project must be identified,
- those involved must be adequately rewarded,
- the focus must be on activities, not machinery.

One final note. Meeting here, just minutes up the street from where key decisions daily are being made. I'd be remiss if I failed to mention another partnership—the relationship between public purpose and formal education. Today the historic partnership between education and the government is unravelling. And the question is not whether there will be cuts, but how deep the cuts will go.

There are aspects of the federal role in education that we could well do without: the heavy hand of regulation; the mind-boggling proliferation of discreet categorical programs that have enlarged bureaucracy; the confusion over means and goals that has forced administrators at all levels into the role of Philadelphia lawyers; and some budget reduction to help strengthen the economy is essential.

But the partnership between the nation's colleges and schools must not be eroded. We cannot, at this late moment in our history, weaken this nation's resolve to serve the coming generation. Education is, as Thomas Jefferson declared, the centerpiece of a free and civil people and we must vigorously oppose those who would, for whatever reason, undermine the nation's colleges and schools. In 1750 Benjamin Franklin wrote to Samuel Johnson, "I think, with you, that nothing is of more importance for the public good than to form, and [train] up youth in wisdom [and] in virtue." Franklin went on to say that, "Wise and good men are, in my opinion, the strength of the state. Much more so than riches or arms, which, under the monument of ignorance and wickedness often draw destruction instead of providing safety for the people."

At this moment—in this city—as national priorities are being aggressively reexamined, I believe the nation's colleges and schools should come together to reaffirm the conviction of Ben Franklin that in the end—nothing is more important to the public good than the training up of youth.

High School/College Cooperative Programs

Michael O'Keefe

High school/college programs are designed to facilitate student articulation, improve the quality of secondary education, and build professional relationships among teachers. The operations of 12 programs from around the country illustrate these objectives.

Programs that attempt to link more closely the high school and the college usually seek to accomplish several purposes. One intention is to facilitate the articulation of the student out of his or her high school program and into college. A variety of approaches have been developed to avoid duplication in coursework, allow students to begin college-level work while still in high school, or even matriculate into college before receiving the high school diploma.

A second general purpose of these programs has been to help improve the quality of secondary education, often with an emphasis on ensuring adequate college readiness for high school graduates. Motivated by mounting concern about the quality of entering freshmen, college faculty have shown increasing interest in facilitating improvements in high school teaching, curriculum, and methods of assessing student progress.

Partly in support of these first two purposes, a third objective of joint programs has been to build professional working relationships between high school teachers and faculty of postsecondary institutions. There has always been a relationship between the professionals at the two levels: Teachers receive their initial training at the academy and many, motivated by salary increases and promotions, continue to take in-service coursework long after graduation. Continuing work is useful and often essential to the professional advancement of the teacher. However, it also often retains many characteristics of the traditional professor-student relationship: The faculty member holds forth while the returning teacher passively waits to receive the word. In contrast, many recent programs have been structured to emphasize the parallel, if different, expertise of both parties as professional educators. In fact, one of the hallmarks of really effective high school/college programs appears to be the extent to which the college faculty and the high school teachers are able to genuinely work together to accomplish their shared goals.

The most recent extensive review of high school/college programs was undertaken in 1977 and reported by Franklin Wilbur and David Chapman. In this essay, directed to secondary school principals, the authors discuss issues associated with joint programs, identify several models for such programs, and provide a short inventory of school/college projects underway in 1977. They also include a brief "consumer's guide" of questions high school principals should be certain to ask colleges interested in establishing cooperative programs.

Given the growing interest among both secondary and postsecondary educators in joint high school/college programs, a more recent survey of such projects would be useful. While this article does not attempt to provide a comprehensive inventory of such programs, it will describe several examples of the various types of joint programs that may serve as models for postsecondary educators who are considering establishing better school/college relationships at their own institutions.

Student and curriculum-oriented programs

Many programs involve a blend of the three purposes identified above. Nonetheless, most also tend to emphasize one of these as the primary objective of the program. There are several distinct types of projects dealing with the articulation of students and the relationship of the curricula of the high school and the college. Students at many high schools have the opportunity to enroll as unmatriculated students in nearby college courses. More rarely, high school students can re-

Michael O'Keefe is vice president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in Washington, D.C. He prepared this paper for publication in Current Issues in Higher Education.

1981 Current Issues in Higher Education

ceive college and sometimes also high school credit for college-level courses taken in the high school. The availability of advanced-placement tests and tests for college credit is widespread today. And, at a few postsecondary institutions younger students can enroll as full-time matriculated students, without having received a high school diploma.

The most prevalent practice may be that of colleges that allow concurrent enrollment of local high school students in their courses. In a 1976 review of college catalogs, the Carnegie Council found that access was offered by about 40 percent of two-year colleges, 25 percent of four-year professional or technical colleges, but only 16 percent of four-year liberal arts colleges. In a 1977 National Institute of Education survey of some 1,500 high schools, about 53 percent reported that college-level courses taught at a local college were regularly available to their students.

Given recent concerns over imminent declines in college enrollment, the number of institutions offering this option has probably increased since the time of these surveys. Providing high school students access to college courses requires little or no relationship with local high schools when the courses are available outside normal high school hours. When regular daytime courses are involved, the policies of local high schools need to be flexible enough to allow released-time for their students. In this case, college administrators usually need to coordinate the program with local high school officials.

As the survey data indicate, this is apparently a widespread practice, usually resulting from contacts between a high school and the local college. However, in at least one case—Oklahoma—a statewide policy of concurrent attendance has been formally established. All high school seniors, with the approval of their principal, are allowed to attend college courses as regular college students. Approval is given only if the student does not have a full load of required high school courses and is judged capable of college work. High school students in Oklahoma usually have about six hours of required courses their last year and can have as few as two hours. The number of students potentially eligible for this program is large. The colleges and universities of the state accept the students for degree credit, basing their acceptance on the screening done by principals. Joint credit—

Particularly important are cordial relationships between high school teachers and the college faculty involved . . .

credit toward a high school diploma and college credit—is not given, although this possibility is under discussion. In this program, most of the teaching takes place at the college. Sometimes, however, when there is large enough enrollment at a given high school in a specific course, the college instructor will come to the high school to teach the course. This innovative statewide program was established as a result of a joint effort between the state high school principals' association and representatives of the Oklahoma postsecondary institutions.

Another approach to providing high school students early access to college is through college-level courses taught in the high school by college faculty. The establishment of such programs obviously involves close cooperation between the high school and college. Particularly important are cordial relationships between high school teachers and the college faculty involved, since the latter are operating in the domain of the former. Little information is available on the extent of this practice. The NIE survey, mentioned above, found that 19 percent of the schools offered college courses at the high school. However, the data do not distinguish between courses taught by college faculty and those taught by the high school teachers themselves.

This latter approach—courses taught to high school students for college credit by high school teachers—has been developed most extensively by Syracuse University in its Project Advance. Over the eight years it has been in operation, the program has served about 25,000 students. Currently, 4,000 seniors in almost 80 high schools in four states are taking fully transferable college-level courses in the sciences, English, psychology, religion, and sociology. The high school teachers who teach the courses serve as adjunct faculty at Syracuse and work closely with Syracuse faculty in developing the courses, establishing standards, etc. Students who successfully complete the courses—and over 90 percent do—receive the usual college credit at Syracuse University. The project has been quite successful, not least of all (from the university's point of view) because it is completely self-supported by student fees. It also has attracted a great deal of interest on the part of secondary schools around the country. However, project staff feel that the program is presently as large as it can get if proper oversight is to be maintained.

For this innovative and effective program to become widely available, more colleges and universities would need to establish similar projects with their local high schools. One example of such a local project is the joint program of St. John's University at Jamaica and Martin Luther King High School in Maspeth, New York. In this program, which is similar to Project Advance, seniors with a strong academic record may take up to four courses, either for college credit alone or to also fulfill their high school requirements. The teachers must be approved by the university before they may teach the courses.

Another example of a local project is the School-College Articulation Program associated with Kenyon College in Ohio. Several years ago the heads of six independent high schools in Ohio joined together to develop a program of college courses for their students. They approached a number of colleges in Ohio and ultimately selected Kenyon College with which to cooperate. Faculty at Kenyon develop the courses jointly with the high school teachers. The teachers, who are

formally appointed "associates in instruction" at Kenyon, teach the courses while Kenyon faculty monitor the project. Participating students receive credit both in the high school and at Kenyon. In this year—the program's second—168 students are enrolled in seven different courses. The project is still growing, with an expected increase to ten courses and about 240 students next year.

To summarize, concurrent enrollment of high school students in local colleges is relatively widely available. Much less so are college courses taught in the high school. And among these, courses taught for college credit by high school teachers are least available. The opportunity for high school students to concurrently fulfill high school course requirements and earn college credit apparently also is quite rare. Taken together, these approaches provide fairly wide access to college-level work for high school students. However, a Carnegie Council survey of college students found that only 7 percent had taken a college course for credit while still enrolled in high school. It seems that either students are not clamoring to take such courses or "availability" does not by itself meet those students' needs. Further examples of high schools that offer cooperative courses with colleges and universities are listed in the study by Wilbur and Chapman.

Combined programs and early entrance

There is no intrinsic logic to the division of the education continuum into a 12-year elementary and secondary program followed by four years of college. History and the political evolution of our structure of education governance has given us an organizational and educational discontinuity at the end of the 12th year. The availability of college courses in high schools is one way of easing this discontinuity. Other approaches can involve substantially greater modification of the existing institutional structure. These include institutions that are, in effect, combined high schools and colleges (usually referred to as middle colleges) as well as programs for early entrance into college for students who have not yet received their high school diploma.

An example of the former is the Middle College of La Guardia Community College in Long Island City, New York. Middle College, which started out in 1974 with about 125 students, has an enrollment this year of about 440 students doing both high school and college work. Students enter in their 11th year and work toward a high school diploma as well as an associate of liberal arts degree. From the perspective of the student, the two programs are melded, with the high school diploma and the college degree each awarded when the requirements are completed. Students take regular high school courses, college courses, and courses or internship work for which they receive concurrent credit. College courses are taught by adjunct faculty in the high school as well as in the regular college setting.

A successful and well-regarded program, Middle College has two distinctive characteristics. First, the students who are recruited into the program are those who, by the program's criterion, have been identified as potential high school dropouts. This is in contrast to the impression that such programs are only for the most obviously college-bound youngsters. A second unusual characteristic is the organizational status of the college. Middle College is, in effect, both a high school and a college. It operates with the joint authority of the Board of Education (as a regular high school in the school system) and the Board of Higher Education (as an academic department within La Guardia Community College). The director of the program is both a principal in the school system and a chairperson in the college (imagine the number of committee meetings!). This duality of location is an important factor in ensuring the unity of program that distinguishes the college.

The shortened time for completion results from a tight integration of the entire six-year course that eliminates the usual overlap and duplication.

A similar organizational structure characterizes Matteo Ricci College in Seattle, Washington, in effect a dual program of Seattle Preparatory School and Seattle University. Students enter the preparatory school program as regular high school freshmen. By the fourth year, they are doing college-level work and receive a high school diploma at the end of that year. After a total of six years, they receive a baccalaureate degree, two years earlier than usual. The actual program is neither an accelerated version of the usual "four plus four" nor is it intended only for the most gifted. The shortened time for completion results from a tight integration of the entire six-year course that eliminates the usual overlap and duplication. The curriculum is carefully planned and structured, both from year to year and among courses within a given year. Because of this, very few students are allowed entry into the program during or after the second year. Students selected for the program must be judged capable of college-level work. However, efforts are made to ensure that the student body is generally representative of the college-bound population.

Established in 1975, the college now enrolls about 780 students, more than 500 of these in the first three years. The first class graduated last year, so it is as yet difficult to generalize about the effectiveness of the program. At the end of the fourth year, about one third of the students transfer to other colleges, apparently because of a desire to attend a different institution for their college career or to pursue a specialization not offered at Seattle University. Of those graduating from the first class, about half have gone on to further academic work in professional or graduate schools.

In both the above programs, students receive the regular high school diploma when requirements have been met. Occasionally, colleges will admit an exceptionally qualified stu-

dent without the diploma for work directly toward the baccalaureate. However, formal programs for early college entry are rare and usually serve small numbers of students. One of the best known and most successful is Simon's Rock of Bard College in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. Students usually enter the Simon's Rock program after completion of the 10th grade. Admission to the program is strict, with attention to both previous academic performance and evidence of maturity and ability to do college-level work. Graduates of the program receive an associate of arts degree after two years. They can then choose to continue another two years for a bachelor's degree. However, most transfer to other four-year institutions after receiving their associate's degree. Students do not receive a high school diploma in the program. Current enrollment is about 260 students. The program leading to the associate degree was established in 1966, with the bachelor's degree added in 1976. Several years ago a transitional studies program for younger students was added. In this new option, the student enrolls after ninth grade and in the first year takes a combination of college-credit courses and basic courses at a high school level for which no credit is given. The student entering this program and continuing through to the bachelor's degree can advance his or her progress toward a bachelor's degree by two full years.

Credit by examination

An overview of ways the transition from high school to college can be eased would be incomplete without brief mention of credit by examination. In the programs providing college courses for high school students discussed above, students earn their credit by completing the course requirements. Students may also gain credit through subject-area examinations that are widely accepted by colleges and universities. Two such testing programs, both administered by the College Board, are the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and Advanced Placement (AP). The CLEP examinations, which include 50 subject areas, were originally developed as a means to assess and place adults beginning or returning to college. Now, however, a large portion of the estimated 220,000 CLEP examinations given each year are taken by young people. According to a Carnegie Council study of college catalogs, more than 90 percent of four-year colleges and universities and 86 percent of two-year institutions accept high achievement on CLEP examinations for credit.

CLEP involves no special coursework outside of what the student would usually take. Advanced Placement, on the other hand, ties a college-level course the student takes at the high school to a standardized test which, if passed, results in college credit. The development of course content, the determination of the material to be covered in the tests, and the grading of the test are all addressed through committees composed of high school and college faculty. Upwards of 90 percent of all postsecondary institutions accept credit gained through Advanced Placement. However, only 40 percent of high schools indicate that they have the program available to their students. In the 1979-80 academic year, 120,000 students took 160,000 AP examinations in 12 different subject areas.

Faculty enrichment and program improvement

The programs described above all have as a common purpose the bridging of the high school/college discontinuity for the student. They seek to overcome the negative aspects of the institutional separation of the two sectors by creating a more coherent and efficient educational program for the student. Often both high school teachers and college faculty are involved in the program. In contrast, other joint high school/college programs seek less to deal with the "articulation" problem than to strengthen the high school curriculum, often through providing enrichment for the high school teachers or through joint teacher-faculty curriculum projects.

As mentioned earlier, in-service education for teachers is quite extensive, for both educational and other reasons. Many of these programs undoubtedly are solid and provide a useful experience for teachers. And many colleges of education, given the decline in demand for new teachers, are reexamining the traditional nature of in-service education programs. Beyond this however, are a number of programs that bring high school teachers and their parallel numbers from subject-area departments of the college or university together in innovative or unusual ways. Each of the examples described here demonstrates how professional working relationships between teachers and professors in the disciplines can enrich the work of both and, in turn, enrich the quality of programs in the secondary school.

One such program operating nationwide is the National Humanities Faculty (NHF). Since 1968, this program has sought to strengthen the teaching and learning of humanities in the schools by establishing working relationships between experts in the humanities and high school teachers and administrators. More than 700 people—mostly drawn from colleges and universities, but also from the performing arts, business, and politics—serve as resource people for the program. Schools apply to NHF to participate in the programs, identifying teams of teachers and administrators who will work with the experts. A project with a specific school may span a year or more, during which time the NHF faculty person travels to the high school for periodic in-service sessions.

During the summers, high school participants attend institutes with NHF faculty for intensive study and curriculum development. The emphasis in the cooperative work is on academic content and on developing the teachers' expertise and understanding. Areas of study include history, language arts, modern languages, the arts, ethics, writing skills, and student literacy. The purpose is to provide an intense, enriching experience for teachers by giving them an opportunity to work with an outstanding scholar or practitioner in their field.

In turn, this is expected to lead to improved instruction for the students in the teachers' high schools.

Another program that seeks to build professional relationships between schools and colleges is the Humanists in Schools program of the California Council for the Humanities. This project, established in 1979, was designed to encourage more than the usual "one-shot" approach to the concept of a scholar visiting or lecturing in the school. Through the program, long-term residencies in the schools are established for humanities faculty from an area college or university. Program staff do the initial screening of scholars and the teacher with whom the scholar will work makes the final selection. Prior to beginning of the residency, the scholar and the teachers work together to plan the program. During the term of residency, the visiting scholar does classroom teaching, community outreach, and fieldwork. He or she also works with teachers as a resource person on curriculum improvement and in-service training. Financial support is provided by both the California Council and the local school district. This program now operates in nine high schools and three middle schools in three California school districts, including Los Angeles. Efforts are underway to expand to nine additional districts.

In the New York City area, the Lincoln Center Institute, and Teachers' College, Columbia University are involved in a very successful collaboration with high schools. In this project, initiated and run by the Institute, groups of teachers from participating high schools are given an intensive experience in analyzing and appreciating works of art, mostly dance, music, and theatre. Participation in the program is determined by the school district which both selects the teams of teachers to participate and commits itself to modest financial support for in-school projects.

The program has two phases. First, the team of teachers attends a three-week summer session in which they see and hear selected works, analyze them in seminars and participatory workshops taught by teaching artists, then hear and see them a second time. If the teachers wish, they can receive credit from Teachers' College for this summer session. In the second phase, the artists who served as faculty help develop programs during the school year and perform for the teacher's classes the same works that formed the substance of the summer session. Participating teachers pay no fees for this program. The costs of the summer session are carried by the Institute and the school districts provide support for the in-school program.

The summer of 1981 is the sixth season for the program and involves about 450 teachers. The Institute strives to establish long-term relationships with the districts; about 800 teachers are part of the ongoing program. This program has been partially supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities. As part of the dissemination of the project, similar programs have been or are now being established in six other cities around the country.

These examples all have been drawn from the humanities. However, the effectiveness of these approaches in establishing enriching professional relationships for high school teachers is not limited to these disciplines. Major efforts in the 1960s to revise high school science curricula provided similar opportunities for teachers and professors in physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics to work together. Many of those relationships have endured and continue to enrich the work of both levels of education.

College/high school communication

As with teacher training, there is a long history of communications between colleges and universities and the high schools who provide them students. Usually carried on through the admissions office, these linkages serve as means to provide information on programs and entrance requirements, and, increasingly, to recruit students. They also informally provide information to high school personnel on the performance of their graduates in college. However, given the increasing concerns of higher educators about the qualifications of entering freshmen, it is becoming important for the schools to have better information on the performance of their graduates.

North Carolina State University at Raleigh has developed a unique way to provide such information. Each summer, each of the nearly 800 high schools from which the previous year's freshmen came receives a summary of its students' performance relative to the entire freshman class. The report includes information such as SAT scores, mean high school grade point average, freshman year grade point average, and performance on freshman English, mathematics, and science courses. These indicators are reported for the entire freshman class and the freshmen from the specific high school. Thus, the high school administrator has accurate information on how his or her students performed with which to evaluate the effectiveness of the high school curricula. In the past, the large number of high schools from which freshmen come made such detailed reporting impractical or too expensive. Now, with most student information in computerized form, such annual reports are relatively easy to produce.

Conclusion

The projects described in this essay are only a few of the undoubtedly many successful school/college programs around the country. However, they probably illustrate both the wide range of projects that have been developed as well as the elements needed for success. Each incorporates a practical recognition of the common elements of the missions of the high school and the college. Most are intended to improve the continuity and effectiveness of the curriculum at both levels. And most address the need to enhance professional relationships between teachers and professors. What is apparent from these examples is that, when these elements are present, many of the problems created by the separateness of the high school and the college can be overcome.

Further Information

Oklahoma Program
James Darlan, principal
East Central High School
12150 East 11th Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74128
918/437-2110

Project Advance
Franklin Wilbur, director
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210
315/423-2404

School-College Articulation Program
Richard Rickard, director
University School
2785 S.O.M. Center
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44011
216/831-2200

Martin Luther King High School, St. John's University
Benjamin Herbrich, principal
Martin Luther King High School
Maspeth, New York 11378
212/874-1202

Middle College
Arthur Greenberg, principal
Middle College of La Guardia Community College
31-11 Thompson Avenue
Long Island City, New York 11101
212/626-8599

Matteo Ricci College
Edwin Weihe, dean
Matteo Ricci College
Seattle, Washington 98122
206/626-5379

Simon's Rock
Sharon K. Pinkerton, director of admissions
Simon's Rock of Bard College
Great Barrington, Massachusetts 01230
413/528-0771

College Level Examination Program/Advanced Placement
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019
212/582-6210

National Humanities Faculty
Benjamin Ladner, executive director
1266 Main Street
Concord, Massachusetts 01742
617/369-7800

Humanists in The Schools
Ann M. Pescatello
California Council for the Humanities
312 Sutter Street, Suite 601
San Francisco, California 94108
415/391-1474

Lincoln Center Institute
Mark Schubart, director
Lincoln Center Institute
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts
140 West 65th Street
New York, New York 10023
212/877-1800

North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Banks C. Talley, Jr., vice chancellor for student affairs
101 Holladay Hall
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
919/737-2446

Carnegie High School Study
Michael O'Keefe
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/387-7200

References

National Institute of Education. *High School '77.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

Wilbur, Franklin P., and Chapman, David W. *College Courses in the High School.* Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.

Humanities for the High Schools

Gale K. Crouse

Extended Teacher Institutes at the University of South Dakota help teams of teachers and administrators from the region's high schools design and implement their own integrated humanities courses. Among the by-products—improved relationships between university and high school educators and among high school teachers.

A friend of mine, a fellow French teacher, was quoted recently in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as saying that college language programs are strengthened through contacts with high school teachers.* That statement will come as no surprise, especially to foreign language teachers long concerned by sagging enrollments and questions of program articulation.** Most of us already have learned the practical value of high school visits, shared activities, and common professional associations. What is rather surprising to some of us is that the *Chronicle* found the pronouncement quotable. Yet in many fields, secondary and postsecondary education have operated in relative isolation. Only recently have a few projects emerged that respond to this newly-perceived need for improved high school/college relationships.

Extended Teacher Institutes

My purpose here will be to describe one such program. The University of South Dakota's program of Extended Teacher Institutes represents a current example of high school teachers and college faculty from several disciplines coming together for a common learning experience, the end result of which is not only a modified (and, we hope strengthened) secondary curriculum, but also a new trust and working relationship among all the individuals and school units involved. Operating under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the program is aimed at developing humanities education in secondary schools. Participants in the Institute come from Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska and South Dakota, and the focus of instruction is the Upper Great Plains region—its history, its people, and its cultural heritage.

The impetus for designing the Institutes grew from a humanities project at the university, a course of integrated studies called "The Cultural Components of Rural America." This two-semester, 18-semester-hour program has been offered to freshmen since 1975. It combines material from the classics, communication, English, history, modern languages, and philosophy into a single, coherent course of study based on themes relevant to the Great Plains region—heroes and discoverers, immigration, war and revolution, women in the West, religious and ethnic diversity, the impact of technology on agriculture, and rural values. Besides information, emphasis is placed on cultural sources, ethical and artistic values, as well as written and spoken communication. While the university has never provided actual materials for precollegiate programs, we felt that many of the practices of this freshman humanities program would be useful to secondary education.

The typical program of studies in most high schools in our area is based on rather narrowly defined departments. Too rarely do courses involve the integration of separate disciplines in the study of historical or current themes that are significant to an understanding of the society in which we live. How often, for example, do American literature teachers and American history teachers pool their resources and plan their classes so that the one will complement the other? Or how often does a literary discussion of science fiction include the viewpoints and values of a person whose primary interest is science or technology. The possibilities for such pairings are

* *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 12, 1981, p. 14.

** See Russell G. Rose, "Bridging the Gap: College Foreign Language Department and High School Teachers, *Bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages* 9 (September 1977) pp. 37-38.

Gale K. Crouse is chairman of the Department of Modern Languages at the University of South Dakota. He presented this paper to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

manifold, limited only by the expertise and the enthusiasm of the teachers themselves.

Although the concept of organizing "units" certainly is not new to high school programs, selecting themes peculiar to the local region is not a widespread practice. Typically, units are based primarily on material available from publishing companies with a large, general clientele. It would be possible and productive, we theorized, to introduce into at least one course study units designed to provide an understanding of the region in which the students live. Furthermore, it would be advantageous to bring threads of information from several disciplines into one course or series of courses, thus demonstrating the interrelationship of knowledge and the coherence of learning.

The purpose of the Extended Teacher Institutes, then, is to assist high school teachers to design and implement integrated humanities courses in their own schools. From the outset there is an understanding that there can be no such thing as a "pre-packaged plan." Each school or school district is different, and any design for curricular change must fit the demands of the local situation.

The participants in the Institute are selected as school teams, each consisting of at least two and probably no more than five teachers and at least one administrator. A team effort ensures several advantages—group interest in the project, common knowledge and familiarity with materials to facilitate planning, the possibility for team teaching or at least shared course planning, and, not incidentally, a willingness within the local administration to encourage or to assist in the realization of any proposed changes. Further, we suggest that each team include teachers of English and social studies, since these disciplines seem to marry most easily and can eventually serve as the core of an integrated humanities project.

Their teaching is coordinated by means of the selected themes, and their presentations are meant to be continuous examples of integrated teaching and learning.

Teams come together for an intensive eight-week classroom instruction session during the summer. Both the high school teachers and the university faculty members are involved full time in this initial phase of the program, and for their work the teachers earn nine hours of graduate credit. The institute draws faculty from the departments of literature, history, speech, science, and education. Their teaching is coordinated by means of the selected themes, and their presentations are meant to be continuous examples of integrated teaching and learning.

Although the summer institute is treated as a single unit of instruction, with all faculty members present throughout the day, in effect there are three separate courses. At the core of the program is the "content" class, where each theme is considered by each individual faculty member, then is treated in a group discussion including a philosopher, a scientist, a historian, and a teacher of literature. The second class is devoted to communication skills. Not only do the high school teachers use the humanities "content" class as a basis for their own formal exercises in speaking and writing, but they attempt to develop more effective ways to communicate to their own students in their own classrooms. The third class is a methods class, taught by faculty from the School of Education. Here the teams work together in exploring humanities sources and designing materials for eventual introduction in their home schools. Here also the advantages and limitations of each school team are analyzed and evaluated in order to lay a realistic ground plan for developing and initiating the new course.

The first step in a long-range plan

The intensive eight-week classroom experience marks only the first step in a long-range plan. It is expected that each team will leave the summer program with new ideas, new materials, and a new enthusiasm, to spend the subsequent academic year working out details of implementation and solidifying unit plans and lesson assignments. The new course actually begins the following fall. Thus, the participants in summer 1980 institute work on planning their course throughout the 1980-81 academic year and introduce it in their high school in September 1981. The summer 1981 institute, with all new participants, will culminate in new course offerings in 1982.

To combat the inertia and procrastination that may develop during the interim year of planning, one-day workshops are scheduled in November and February, as well as periodic visits by university faculty. Teams report their progress, compare their work with that of the other schools, exchange suggestions, and share frustrations with understanding colleagues.

Preliminary evaluations of the program are encouraging. Even though it was a totally new kind of experience for everyone involved, the 1980 summer program was well received, by students and faculty alike. At present, the teams are on schedule, working to prepare their new courses for the 1981-82 school year. If the result of the institutes were to be solely the development and inauguration of new humanities courses, then it seems likely that the goal will be met.

Unplanned benefits

But there appear to be added benefits in such a program, some entirely unintentional but which may prove over time to be just as valuable as the planned, primary objective. The

intensity of the institute, the many hours of working together, allowed close relationships to develop among university and high school participants. There is little doubt that the University of South Dakota has grown in stature in the eyes of many teachers and principals. Some high school seniors may be steered to our institution as a result of their teachers' summer experiences.

Another unplanned development was that teachers from the same high school came to know each other in a different way—familiar coffee-room faces became intelligent beings with areas of expertise. Consequently, an English teacher and a history teacher from a very small school in Nebraska have already totally reorganized their courses to allow for a shared syllabus and even some shared teaching. Two teams from another small Nebraska community, one from the public school and one from a parochial school, did not know each other at all before the summer's experience. Now they are attempting to develop a program in which they all can participate, sharing facilities, time, and students.

By 1983 approximately 20 high schools in the Great Plains region will have put into operation some sort of integrated humanities program.

At this point, the successes of our program surpass the shortcomings, but some of the problems deserve mention. Teachers are not permanent installations in a school, and one of our teams disintegrated when all three members accepted last-minute job offers. The NEH agreement provided for stipends to help participants cover costs of the program; at least two individuals were less than enthusiastic about the work involved and obviously remained in the program only to receive the final stipend check. Also, as seems inevitable, one faculty member and one participant developed a severe case of incompatability. But these were clearly exceptions and did not jeopardize the integrity of the work accomplished.

The future of the Extended Teacher Institutes is difficult to project beyond 1982–83 when NEH funding ends. Most likely, the institutes cannot be maintained in the present form. Certainly stipends can no longer be awarded to participants, for example. It does seem feasible that the program continue in a modified, simplified form. "Integrated humanities" may take on a narrower connotation as fewer faculty members address themselves to high school teachers drawn from fewer disciplines. For example, the integration of materials from English and history would seem to be a realistic goal, and a class designed to this end could easily become a part of the regular summer curriculum of these two academic departments. It may be, too, that regional interest will allow the institute to continue in something close to its present form, except on a completely self-supporting basis. What is certain, however, is that financial considerations will play a leading role in determining the future shape and direction of the program.

Whatever course the project may take in the next two years, it will have fulfilled its primary purpose. By 1983 approximately 20 high schools in the Great Plains region will have put into operation some sort of integrated humanities program. The university also will have formed new alliances with teachers and with school districts. University faculty members from several disciplines will be more aware of the general context of the secondary curriculum and can adjust their own teaching accordingly. As a result, in some small yet significant way, for those high school students continuing into higher education the chasm between high school and college learning may be bridged more effectively.

Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project

Janet R. Brown

High school and college faculty and administrators cooperated to develop an integrated English curriculum for 11th grade through freshman year. The Queens English Project also yielded insights on the process of implementing innovations.

"Why are so many students who have done good work in high school English placed in a remedial English course when they reach college?" This question, posed to a faculty member supervising student teachers in a local high school, launched a collaborative venture that became the Queens English Project. The program represents a partnership between the City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education designed to improve the reading and writing skills of 11th- and 12th-grade students and of freshmen enrolled in the Queens College sequence of required composition courses.

The question, raised in 1973, led to meetings between high school English chairpersons and faculty from the English and Secondary Education departments of Queens College. Out of these meetings grew a more formal organization, Common Concerns of English Educators. This group conducted monthly meetings, co-chaired by a high school chairperson and a college faculty member, that provided college faculty a better understanding of the nature of the high school English curriculum. As a result, the College made some revisions in its curriculum for the initial levels of English composition.

At this point, the group recognized that to implement any of the new curriculum ideas in the high school classrooms, outside financial help would be necessary to bring high school teachers into the group and to develop curriculum materials. After lengthy discussion, the college faculty wrote a grant proposal that received funding from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

A reading and writing curriculum—11th grade through freshman year

Fall of 1978 marked the official beginning of the Queens English Project. A principal goal of this project was to design an articulated curriculum in reading and writing that would span the three years from 11th grade through freshman year. The commitment and success of the college's composition faculty in working with open-admissions students provided a basis upon which to build this articulated curriculum.

During the fall of 1978 teachers from four high schools with their department chairpersons met with Queens College personnel in weekly, two-hour seminars. During the semester we went through together the activities in the syllabus for the initial pre-college writing course, English 01. Our high school curriculum would be designed to lead into this course.

We developed into a community of readers and writers and did together those things we would ask our students to do. We discussed the results and tried some of the activities in our own classrooms. We derived from these experiences the principles we thought might be teachable. Working collaboratively, we began to put together syllabi that could be integrated into high school English classes.

The next spring, while continuing the seminars, we pilot-tested the syllabi in the high school classrooms. And along with the new syllabi, we launched a program of writing workshops staffed by paid college-student tutors.

These tutors were undergraduate and graduate students who write well and enjoy it. Although they were not required to be English majors, they had to submit writing samples and a recommendation from an English professor. In interviews, project staff used role-playing and actual essays by former

---

Janet R. Brown is director of assessment testing and research at Queens College, City University of New York. *She presented a version of this paper to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.*

The work reported here was done as part of the Queens English Project under a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The author acknowledges the contributions of her colleagues in the Project: Judith Fishman, Betsy Kaufman, Donald McQuade, Marie Ponsor, and Sandra Schor.

students to see how well the prospective tutors understood and handled problems of the essays and of the students. Those selected as tutors received training in seminars, conducted by a member of the project faculty, where they went over the syllabi used in the high school classes and themselves did the assignments the high school students would be doing. They also discussed specific tutoring problems, such as assisting students whose native language is not English.

The college tutors worked with high school students in a program of "writing workshops." Actually these were tutoring centers or labs where students from the project classes worked with tutors individually or in groups of two or three. In this setting, the students read, discussed, and rewrote their class essays and worked on specific writing problems. The activities in the workshops were designed to reinforce and supplement the students' regular classroom assignments by giving them extra practice in reading and writing and immediate feedback about their writing from tutors and peers.

In most schools the writing workshop hours overlapped with the project classes; students were sent out of the classroom to get special help in the workshop. In one school, students were assigned to the workshop for an hour each week in addition to their regular class. Often the tutors came into the classroom to assist the teacher and work with small groups of students there.

At each school the workshop program was supervised by a coordinator who helped teachers and tutors with materials and planning, coordinated classroom and workshop activities, and provided liaison between the high school and the college. All of these coordinators had taught or were teaching as adjunct faculty in the college's English composition program.

In the fall of 1979 we added a school to the project, and with syllabi that had been revised over the summer we began a full year's work with the project. At this point our weekly seminars included 15 high school teachers from five high schools, five high school English department chairpersons, six college faculty members, and five workshop coordinators. The tutors met separately in their own biweekly training sessions.

On the college campus, two of the workshop coordinators taught a special version of the English 01 composition class, offered for freshmen who had taken the project classes in high school. Although the English 01 syllabus had provided the basis for the high school program, the coordinators made additional modifications to make it fit more closely with that used in the high schools. Unfortunately, the freshmen encountered so many difficulties in scheduling the special class around their other classes the effort had to be discontinued.

Beyond the initial funding

At the end of the 1979-80 academic year, the initial FIPSE grant concluded, but no one wanted to see the project end. All of us were convinced that the work we had been doing was successful. Teachers had seen improvement in their students' writing and the principals of the five high schools wanted to continue the work of the project. As you may know, FIPSE will not re-fund a project, no matter how good it may have been. The Fund's commitment is to institutionalization. After our experience, I am inclined to agree with them.

During that summer we held preliminary discussions with the borough superintendent of Queens and the five school principals about institutionalizing some aspects of the project. The district superintendent agreed to allow the principals of the five schools to use some discretionary funds to pay college tutors to continue their work in the schools. In addition, the superintendent in charge of high schools for New York City agreed to provide additional funds to each high school to allow a project teacher some released time to coordinate the workshop and to supervise the tutors. Armed with this support, we went to the college administration and two of us were given half-time releases to continue the work of the project—training the tutors, supervising their work, visiting the high schools, providing on-going support, and conducting seminars for the new teachers.

. . . the most encouraging aspect has been the willingness of the high school principals to endorse the project by providing the money to pay the college tutors. The next step . . . is to have the board of education assume the costs the college currently is underwriting.

Since then, we have added another school and several more schools are waiting to join us. New teachers have been coming to seminars with the tutors to learn about the curriculum. But the most encouraging aspect has been the willingness of the high school principals to endorse the project by providing the money to pay the college tutors. The next step toward institutionalization is to have the board of education assume the costs the college currently is underwriting, namely released time of one full college faculty member to recruit and train tutors.

We also have been fortunate this year in having the services of one of the original teachers in the project who has been on sabbatical and volunteered some time to assist in the tutor training and supervision and in liaison with high schools other than his own. We anticipate that next year several more of the original high school teachers also will be eligible for sabbaticals and that one of them may be willing to work with the project in some capacity.

I wish at this point I could tell you that we have hard evidence that the project has been successful. We have many indicators suggesting that something positive has happened. We have teachers who continue to be committed to the work of the project and who attend seminars even though they are no longer being paid to do so. The department chairpersons also continue to support the project and to facilitate its work

by providing time for us and the tutors, by attending seminars, and by arranging schedules and room assignments. We have principals who have dug into their pockets to pay for tutors. We have a borough superintendent who has provided the principals with incentives to dig into their pockets. We have a city-wide superintendent of high schools who has provided the equivalent of 1.2 teachers' salaries to cover the released time for the teacher who coordinates the tutoring in the schools. This general commitment suggests that the partnership between the high schools and the college is working and is perceived as having been instrumental in improving the skills of the teachers and the students in the project.

Evaluation results

We have carried out a formal evaluation of the project using an experimental control group design with pre- and posttest scores on reading and writing. When we undertook this evaluation, however, we knew that the probability of achieving significant differences between experimentals and controls was very low. The differences among the five schools that participated in the project are large; therefore, we suspected that we could not compare schools with each other and that we could not group all the experimentals and all the controls and do a single analysis. Our preliminary analyses of the pretest data verified our beliefs.

We then undertook within-school analyses for the three schools in which both experimental and control groups could be designated. Two schools could not provide controls: One could not because the program in that school is elective and there was no comparable class to the experimental class; the other school could not provide a control group because the chairperson wanted all the regular 12th-grade English classes to be in the program. When we did the within-school analysis, we discovered that the program was differentially successful for different teachers. In other words, the within-school differences turned out to be as large as the between-school differences. We were unable to control for the teacher variables and the student variables which, as almost all research suggests, account for much of the difference between groups. These differences, unfortunately, operate in the analyses as error and function to suppress differences that may exist because of the program effects.

When we did the within-school analysis, we discovered that the program was differentially successful for different teachers.

All of this is not meant as an apology, but to state the facts of life involved in trying to conduct research in a field setting. I am suggesting that the absence of hard data does not necessarily mean that nothing happened, only that one must turn to other sources of evidence and analyses, which require different assumptions and beliefs.

In an attempt to demonstrate that something happened we had decided prior to data analysis to look closely at the teachers involved in the project. It was apparent to us, from observing classes, from working with the teachers in seminars, and from reading the syllabi, that the teachers varied greatly in their degree of commitment, their depth of understanding, and their ability to implement the principles that underlie the syllabi and the project.

Using some of the research in innovation adoption by Gene Hall and his associates at the University of Texas at Austin, we decided to try to categorize the teachers on the basis of their "levels of use" of the innovation. As described by Hall et al.:

> *Levels of use are distinct states that represent observably different types of behavior and patterns of innovation use as exhibited by individuals. . . . These levels characterize a user's development in acquiring new skills and varying use of the innovation. Each level encompasses a range of behaviors.* *

These levels range from not knowing that the innovation exists through eight stages in the development of the individual toward innovation adoption and ultimately to an active, sophisticated, and highly effective use of it. Hall further hypothesizes that "growth in quality of use of an innovation (movement toward higher levels) by most individuals is developmental." (p. 52)

Using the Level of Use scale, project staff rated each of the teachers in the project on two dimensions: their knowledge and understanding of the principles of the project and their actual implementation of these principles through the activities they conducted with their classes. The ratings for each category were averaged and the category averages were combined for each individual to produce a single composite score, designated as that individual's level of use. The ratings were determined for the teachers after they had an opportunity to use the project materials for three semesters. Hall and his colleagues have found that after three cycles of use, 30 to 40 percent of an innovation's users are stable at Level of Use IV-A, the routine level in which use of the innovation is stabilized and most problems of organization and management have been mastered.

Of the 15 teachers in our project, we found that five had reached Level V, the state in which the innovation has been refined and the user is combining his or her own efforts with the efforts of colleagues to maximize the impact on students. Another four teachers were at Level IV-A, the routine level of use, and of that four, two were moving toward Level IV-B, the

* G. Hall, S. Loucks, W. Rutherford, and B. Newlove, "Levels of Use of the Innovation: A Framework for Analyzing Innovation Adoption," *Journal of Teacher Education* 26 (Spring 1975), p. 34.

refinement level in which the user is varying the innovation to increase its impact. Thus we found that 9 of the 15, or 60 percent of the teachers in our project, were at Level IV-A or higher.

. . . the teachers unanimously believed that they had changed in a positive direction and that their students had changed.

One teacher was at Level III, the mechanical use level. Of the remaining five teachers, two were using some aspects in some ways, experimenting with certain activities although they had not fully committed themselves to the entire package. We called them low-level users. The remaining three teachers had made virtually no changes in the direction of adoption, although they did attend seminars, have the syllabi available, and use tutors and the writing workshop with their students. What is significant is that 80 percent of the teachers were using at some level the various pieces that characterize the innovation.

We used the Levels of Use categories as the basis for one set of analyses to determine if, in fact, there were any measurable differences between students in classes of teachers with various levels of use. The results of this analysis are mixed because there was so much difference in the entry levels of students in the different classes. The only observable trend in the data showed students in classes with high and moderate users (Level III and up) making greater gains in writing scores than students in classes with teachers who were below Level III in use.

We also distributed to the teachers a questionnaire in which we asked them for their perceptions of their performance in the project as compared to their prior performance. Their responses showed that they believed almost unanimously that they had made moderate to large changes and that their students also had made changes in a positive direction.

To sum up, most of the statistical evidence that would demonstrate the success of the project is disappointing, as we expected it would be. We did, however, find that the overwhelming majority of the teachers had adopted substantial portions of the innovation. Furthermore, the teachers unanimously believed that they had changed in a positive direction and that their students had changed.

In fact, at one of the high schools this fall, the English chairperson insisted that we look at the results of last spring's Regents examination in English. In this school, all of the regular 12th-grade classes had been involved in the project. We looked at a random sample of the exam papers scored by the 12th-grade English teachers. In many cases, students who might have failed the exam passed because the essay section was strong enough to pull their scores up to a passing level. The department chairperson told us that usually the reverse is true: A student achieves a passing grade with a good score on the short-answer section that compensates for a poorly written essay. This chairperson and the teachers in her school are convinced by this evidence that something significant has happened.

All the data on the Queens English Project are not in. Change in behavior occurs slowly. The change in teacher behavior is developmental. The change in student behavior as measured by reading and writing scores also is developmental. Not only is the rate of change relatively slow, it is uneven. Some people make big gains initially and level off, some make small gains at a fairly constant rate over a long period of time, some people spurt at the end. Only fairly comprehensive longitudinal studies can hope to demonstrate that change occurs.

We do know in the case of our project that our partnership with the schools is working. Both they and we remain committed to the principles and practices of the project, and both they and we are continuing and expanding our relationship. Both the high schools and the college have been able to make the changes necessary to carry on and to expand this collaborative effort.

A model for change

Our experience in the Queens English Project over the past two and a half years has led us to draw some conclusions about what is involved in making an impact on large, bureaucratic institutions. Graphically, the situation could be represented as a pyramid made up of several strata. Within this pyramid, influence, reward, and interaction generally occur downward. To produce change at the bottom we must produce change at the top. Yet there is little evidence to suggest that a "trickle down" model is effective in producing widespread change in schools. However, the pyramid might be sliced vertically so that persons from all strata could be influenced simultaneously. This model, we believe, maximizes the potential for change because commitment is mutually achieved and reinforced, there is mutual sensitivity to others' points of view and roles, and the barriers created by the strata are broken down in the face of an overriding goal that can be achieved only through cooperation.

This model recognizes the primary role of the teacher in effecting change in student behavior, but it also stresses the equally important role of administrators in facilitating change. We are convinced that putting teachers and administrators together in the seminars, exposing them to the principles and practices of the project, and having them work together as a community of readers and writers in deriving solutions to their common problems is the way to produce change. Had we been aware at the beginning of this project how potent this model is, we would have designed retreats to involve administrators at higher levels in the pyramid with the chairpeople and the teachers. After two and a half years, it is apparent to

us that only because administrators at all levels in both the college and the schools have been willing to support and facilitate the changes embodied in the project, have we been successful in changing the way instruction in reading and writing is delivered to students.

The relationship embodied in the Queens English Project continues to grow and develop. We are convinced of the educational, social, and financial benefits that can be realized through collaborative efforts to solve mutual problems. We invite you to develop similar relationships and to participate in an exciting and rewarding experiment.

Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study

George H. Hanford

Stressing quality and equality in the high school/college articulation, the College Board is reviewing and recommending revised college preparatory curricula. Decreasing the high school dropout rate and increasing the number of better-prepared college students are its goals.

In 1979, the College Board began the first stages of a decade-long, nationwide effort to conduct a thorough review of the college preparatory curriculum in this country, and to take leadership in helping revive and reform that curriculum.

Drawing upon the active participation of teachers and administrators from among its 2,500 school and college membership, the goal of this project is to forge out of a combined school/college effort a consensus on what the patterns of academic preparation should be toward the end of this century. As a result of this consensus we hope to decrease the high school dropout rate, to prepare high school students better academically, and to increase the number of college-bound students.

The name of Project EQuality was developed to indicate that the inseparable objectives of the project are to support both quality and equality in education, and thus to serve the broad interests of society and the individual aspirations of its youth. We believe that the project can revive a commitment to high standards and a dedication to quality in learning that will permeate not only the schools, but perhaps even the social and economic structures that depend so heavily upon them. Our work is fully compatible with similar activities underway by such other groups as The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and The National Academy of Education. We are keeping in touch with them, and we feel that the several endeavors will indeed derive both strength and support from our mutual convictions.

During the fall and winter of 1980 the project concentrated its efforts on active dialogues among school and college teachers, curriculum specialists, and academic deans who serve on some 40 different committees of the College Board. Their deliberations ranged across all academic fields, and sought to reach some general agreements on academic competencies and subject matter content as they relate to college admissions. In the spring, we extended and expanded discussions to some 200 individuals in seven urban areas, representing open-admissions colleges and secondary schools serving large populations of minority and disadvantaged students.

A three-day national invitational symposium, held in May 1981, brought many participants from the earlier dialogues together with representatives of professional education organizations and members of the College Board staff. The purpose of this conference was to explore in detail possible patterns of preparation for postsecondary education—the kinds of learning experiences and the basic academic competencies that students should be bringing to college in the later 1980s. The symposium, in other words, was a search for consensus. It became apparent to participants that certain basic academic skills—reading, writing, speaking and listening, doing mathematics, reasoning, studying, and an elusive quality variously defined as seeing, observing, or perceiving—were necessities for all students moving on to college, regardless of what type of institution they might plan to enter.

Basic areas of agreement

It also became clear that there were basic areas of agreement on the breadth of subject matter coverage that will be needed by all college-bound students. These are English, mathematics (including computer experience), history and social sciences, natural science, foreign or a second language, and the visual and performing arts. It was evident, further, that the inherent relationships between the skills and subject matter areas needed additional exploration and clarification in subsequent phases of the work. From these broad agreements

---

George Hanford is president of The College Board, a nonprofit organization of some 2,500 colleges, secondary schools, and education agencies. He reported on the project at the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

will be refined in considerable detail, over many months, the essence of the shape and substance for the new curriculum.

The findings and recommendations of this conference are being published and distributed, giving us a firm base to move on the next stages of Project EQuality. More important, however, is the fact that the participants themselves have become a cadre of dedicated, experienced, and influential individuals who will continue to play a key role in emerging aspects of the project. Some will be acting alone, some within their own institutions and venues; others will work in liaison with us at the Board. All will be moving to improve upon and advance the principles developed at the symposium.

Plans for the coming months include further discussions with professional associations; additional dialogues in different parts of the country, building upon a newly-defined alliance between school and college personnel; and expanded communications about the project and its progress to additional segments of education and to the public, especially parents and legislators.

One practical application

The Project EQuality strategies for reform also will have some very practical applications. One of these applications begins in fall 1981 in the San Antonio area, with help from a $1 million grant from the Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation. There the College Board will begin a three-year project designed to increase substantially the numbers of college-bound minority students, and at the same time inaugurate coordinated activities to improve the quality of the college-preparatory curriculum. This effort potentially will affect every 11th-grade student in Bexar County, Texas.

In one phase of the program, the results of a free administration of the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT) to all 11th-graders will be used along with other criteria to help identify able minority students and to encourage them to consider moving on to college. The program also will provide special counseling and tutoring in reading, writing, math, general studies, and test-taking skills during the final year of high school. Financial aid opportunities will be explored for these students, and, through the cooperation of participating school districts and colleges, they will be in a better position to continue their education as undergraduates.

Another part of the San Antonio program will enable students who score particularly well on the PSAT/NMSQT to begin college-level Advanced Placement courses in their own high schools during their senior year. Upon successful completion of AP courses and the year-end examination, these students may earn AP credit or placement at more than 1,500 colleges and universities throughout the country. AP of course, has been an on-going College Board national program for some 25 years, with 120,000 candidates participating yearly, but this is the first time it will have been implemented on this concentrated a scale in a major metropolitan area. Other aspects of the San Antonio program include special teacher preparation, workshops, student orientation programs, and the development of academic materials and supplies.

This comprehensive approach affecting schools, colleges, and especially students in the San Antonio area—with its large Hispanic population—should provide vital information for later stages of the EQuality effort. It may well become a national model for similar endeavors that typify the fundamental goals of the project: to improve and extend quality and equality together.

Current Issues in Higher Education

Copies of the 1980 and 1981 *Current Issues in Higher Education* are available individually or in sets, at the prices shown below. Bulk discounts are available. To prices listed add 15% postage/handling charge. All orders under $15 must be prepaid. Make checks payable to AAHE and mail to AAHE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036; 202/293-6440.

1981 Series—Complete set $15.

1. High School/College Partnerships ($3.50) • High School/College Partnerships That Work—Ernest L. Boyer • High School/College Cooperative Programs—Michael O'Keefe • Humanities for the High Schools—Gale K. Crouse • Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project—Janet R. Brown • Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study—George H. Hanford.

2. Creating an Integrated Curriculum—The 'Higher' in Higher Education ($3.50) • What Is 'Higher' About Higher Education?—Harlan Cleveland • Curricular Integration: Mortar for the Ivory Tower—Mary Jim Josepha • Integrative General Education: The Saint Joseph's Model—John Nichols • An Integrative Program for Building Skills: The City and The Self—Susan Gurewitsch

3. Partnerships with Business and the Professions ($3.50) • New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and the Professions—K. Patricia Cross • A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development—Ernest A. Lynton • Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals—Philip A. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern

4. Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities ($3.50) • Overview—Thomas A. Emmet • Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them?—Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman • The Legal Position of Part-Timers—John Andes • Faculty Development For Part-Timers—Richard Bagwell and Ione Elliott

5. New Technologies for Higher Education ($3.50) • Overview—Raymond J. Lewis, Jr. • What Makes A Telecourse?—Rodger A. Pool • Curriculum Issues in Telecommunications—Adele F. Seeff • Administration Issues in Telecommunications—Marlowe Froke • Adapting to the Computer Revolution—John H. Strange

1980 Series—Complete set $15

1. Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality ($3.50) • When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality"?—Alexander W. Astin • Measuring the Quality of Student Effort—C. Robert Pace • Commentary on Pace—Mark Curtis • The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising—Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes • Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?—Robert J. Menges • Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?—Robert T. Blackburn, Glen Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell • What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching?—Hans O. Mauksch

2. Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience—Charles I. Bunting • Commentary on Bunting—Charles Bingman, Sol Pelavin, Kenneth W. Tolo • **Proliferation and Agency Effectiveness in Accreditation: An Institutional Bill of Rights**—H. R. Kells • Commentary on Kells—Robert L. Ketter, William H. Knisely, Kenneth E. Young ($3.50)

3. Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries ($2.50) • How Well Are Faculty Paid? Implications of the Academic Reward Structure—Kristine E. Dillon and Robert H. Linnell • The Economic Decline of the Professoriate in the 80's: What Happened to Faculty Salaries and What Are the Implications?—Peggy Heim

4. New Models for General Education ($2.50) • General Education for a Contemporary Context—Jerry G. Gaff • Quality and the Campus: The High School/College Connection—Ernest L. Boyer • Curricular Priorities for the 80's: Beyond Retrenchment—John C. Sawhill

5. Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice ($2.50) • Adult Development: A Workable Vision for Higher Education—Arthur W. Chickering • Faculty and Student Development in the 80's: Renewing the Community of Scholars—L. Lee Knefelkamp

6. Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Insitutional ($3.50) • Basing Public Policy on Student Achievement: A New Agenda Item—Francis Keppel • Commentary on Keppel—Willard L. Boyd, Alice J. Irby, Elizabeth H. Johnson, Thurston E. Manning • New Roles for the States in Monitoring Higher Education Quality—Carl Kaysen and the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education—The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size—Richard M. Cyert